



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/653,255

09/03/2003

Katsuhiko Matsusaka

009683-481

2789

21839 7590 09/30/2008  
BUCHANAN, INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC  
POST OFFICE BOX 1404  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

HUSSAIN, TAUQIR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/30/2008

ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ADIPFDD@bipc.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/653,255	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MATSUSAKA, KATSUHIKO	
	<b>Examiner</b> TAUQIR HUSSAIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/29/2008 has been entered.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. This office action is in response to amendment /reconsideration filed on 07/29/2008, the amendment/reconsideration has been considered. Claims 1-6, 10-13, 15-17 and 18 have been amended. Claims 1-20 are pending for examination, the rejection cited as stated below.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2152

5. Claim 1, 2, 4-15 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham et al. (Patent No.: US 6327608 B1), hereinafter "Dillingham" in view of Berchtold et al (Patent No.: US 6678705 B1), hereinafter "Berchtold".

6. As to claim 1, 10 and 17, Dillingham discloses the core concept of document registration or upload, including, a first transmission portion sending from a client to a server for inquiring about folder tree structure at the server (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-214, Abstract, where client sends a request to a server for file system object);

a second transmission portion at said server, transmitting the folder structure to said client in response to the inquiry sent from said client (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-228, Abstract, where server sends the directory/folder path or tree back to client);

a third transmission portion, at said client, designating a storage folder in the form of a reply sent from said server (Dillingham, Fig.5, Abstract, where client browse the directory in reply to server response);

Dillingham however is silent on disclosing explicitly, and sending to said server with an attached file or a storage portion, at said server, storing the attached file in the storage folder as designated, in response to the mail sent from said client.

Berchtold however discloses, sending to said server with an attached file or a storage portion at said server (Berchtold, Fig.1, element-125, Abstract, where contents of the email is storage portion), storing the attached file in the storage folder as designated, in response to the mail sent from said client (Berchtold, Fig.1, element-125,

Art Unit: 2152

Abstract, where contents of the email is storage portion and archiving is storing the file at the server).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Dillingham with the teachings of Berchtold in order to provide an architecture for document archival built on network-centric groupware such as Internet standards-based messaging. Archiving and retrieving and classifying documents into meaningful collections is accomplished in a manner similar to sending email to recipients, retrieving messages from folders, and classifying messages into folder hierarchies.

7. As to claims 2 and 15, Dillingham and Berchtold disclose the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 and 10 above including, wherein said second transmission portion sends the folder structure to the client in text format (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-228, where client script is a text format), and when receiving the folder structure in text format, said third transmission portion designates a storage folder by quoting that text (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-214, Col.2, lines 38-45, where new path is equivalent to quoting the text).

8. As to claims 4-5 and 11-12, Dillingham and Berchtold discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 and 10, including, reply from server performs authentication by comparing client information described in the inquiry mail sent from the client with client information as registered (Berchtold, Col.8, lines 10-15, where client is successfully authenticated and it is obvious that there has to be some

Art Unit: 2152

mechanism to compare client information before authentication), and sends the folder tree structure by mail only to the client that is successfully authenticated (Berchtold, Col.8, lines 10-15, where it is obvious and well known also that server providing access to only authorized users).

9. As to claims 6 and 13, Dillingham and Berchtold discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1 and 10, including, wherein said second transmission portion sends together a character string of information indicative of current log-in when sending the folder structure to the client by mail (Dillingham, Drawing-4, Col.2, lines 46-50, where client request for new path is a string and can be interpret as request in real time and therefore can be equivalent to current log-in to an account).

10. As to claims 7 and 14, are rejected for the same rationale as applied to claim 4 and 5 above.

11. As to claim 8, Dillingham and Berchtold discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 1, including, wherein said third transmission portion attaches and sends a plurality of file to one mail (Berchtold, Col.3, lines 15-20, where attached document is archived to the server and further is known in the art that more than one files can be attached and transmit via email).

12. As to claim 9, is rejected for the same rationale as applied to claim 3 and 8 above.

Art Unit: 2152

13. Claim 3, 16 and 18-20, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dillingham and Berchtold as applied above in view of Mutton et al. (Pub. No.: US 2002/0147840 A1), hereinafter "Mutton".

14. As to claims 3 and 16, Dillingham and Berchtold discloses the invention substantially as in parent claims 1 and 10, including, wherein said second transmission portion sends its folder structure to the client (Dillingham, Fig.4, element-228, where client script is a text folder path).

Dillingham and Berchtold however, are silent on using HTML format to point to directory structure and when receiving the folder structure in HTML format, said third transmission portion designates a storage folder by clicking the storage folder.

However, Mutton discloses, sending the directory structure in HTML format (Mutton, [0072], where hyperlink to the file structure is embedded in email) and said third transmission portion designates a storage folder by clicking the storage folder (Mutton, [0039], where hyperlinks are used to direct the link to appropriate/designated file location).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Iwasaki as applied to claim 1 and 2 above with the teachings of Mutton in order to provide a software for constructing option encoding reference tags for the link servers, thus eliminating the need to learn formal request requirements of the link server.

Art Unit: 2152

15. As to claims 18 and 20, Dillingham and Berchtold and Mutton discloses the invention substantially as in parent claim 17 above, including, wherein processing is changed in accordance with a title of a mail sent from the client (Mutton, [0022], where link referral system including a classification arrangement for classifying web pages which system process are disclosed).

16. As to claim 19, is rejected for the same rationale applied to parent claim 17 above.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TAUQIR HUSSAIN whose telephone number is (571)270-1247. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571 272 3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. H./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2152

/Dohm Chankong/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2152